

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. In this amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 8 and 9 are amended and claims 12-22 are added. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hurтта, et al. (US 2005/0135375, hereinafter "Hurтта"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites (A) TPF determining whether a bearer event matches an event trigger and (C) TPF determining whether the bearer event matches a re-authorization trigger. Applicant respectfully submits that Hurтта does not disclose or suggest the required two "determining" steps based on the same bearer event.

In rejecting step (A), the Office Action refers to paragraph [0049] where the bearer event is alleged to be a request for bearer establishment and in rejecting step (C) the Office Action refers to paragraph [0072] where the bearer event is alleged to be a network type change. Claim 1, however, requires the same bearer event in both steps (A) and (C), i.e., "a bearer event" in (A) and "the bearer event" in (C).

Thus, Hurтта fails to disclose the above elements of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over the references of record in view of their dependence on an allowable claim as well as the additional limitations.

For example, claim 2 directly depends from claim 1 and further recites that CRF returning to TPF a selected charging rule, which is also not disclosed or suggested by Hurtta. The Office Action simply asserts in the action that paragraph [0055] of Hurtta teaches the further elements of claim 2. However, it cannot be seen how Hurtta teaches these additional elements in claim 2.

As another example, claim 3 directly depends from claim 2 and further recites “TPF providing CRF with the bearer event”. That is to say, claim 3 further specifies that the TPF shall inform the bear event to the CRF, which is also not disclosed or suggested by Hurtta. The Office Action simply asserts that paragraph [0050] of Hurtta teaches the further elements of claim 3. However, it cannot be seen how Hurtta teaches these additional elements in claim 3.

As a further example, claim 4 directly depends from claim 2 and further defines that said step B further comprises: TPF determining whether said charging rule provided by CRF is changed, if it is, the TPF performs a re-authorization process. As shown, claim 4 requires check to whether the charging rule provided by CRF is changed. In contrast, as discussed above, Hurtta is the change of the access network type.

As yet another example, claim 9 directly depends from claim 1 and further defines that said performing a re-authorization process comprises: TPF requesting re-authorization of a credit in the OCS, and further receiving the authorized credit returned by the OCS, which is also not disclosed or suggested by Hurtta. The Office Action simply asserts in the action that paragraph [0072] of Hurtta teaches the further elements of claim 9. However, it cannot be seen how Hurtta teaches these additional elements in claim 9.

New Claims

New claims 12-22 are added herein. No new matter is introduced. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 12-22 are patentable over Hurtt as well, as the reference of record fails to disclose or teach the limitations or render obvious of these claims.

Independent claim 12 is directed to a flow based charging system and recites a traffic plane function entity communicatively connected to a charging rule function entity and an online charging system (OCS), wherein, when a bear modification occurs, the traffic plane function entity first determine, using event triggers, whether to request a charging rule from the charging rule function entity, and then determine, using re-authorization triggers, whether to perform a re-authorization process with the online charging system. Hurtt fails to teach or render obvious the limitations of claim 12.

Claims 13-17 depend from independent claim 12 and thus are allowable over the reference of record.

Independent claim 18 is directed to a method corresponding to the system in claim 12 and recites "when a bear modification occurs, first determining, using event triggers, whether to request a charging rule from a charging rule function (CRF) entity in a flow based charging system, the determining performed by a traffic plane function (TPF) entity in the flow based charging system; and then determining, by the TPF entity using re-authorization triggers, whether to perform a re-authorization process with an online charging system (OCS) in the flow based charging system." Claim 18 is not taught or disclosed by Hurtt.


Claims 19-22 depend from independent claim 18 and thus are allowable over the cited reference as well.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been properly traversed or rendered moot. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Ira S. Matsil, Applicant's attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

3/8/10
Date



Brian A. Carlson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 37,793

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218